

REMARKS

Summary of Office Action

Claims 11-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Molsen et al. (US Pat. 6,122,024) in view of Sekine et al. (US Pat. 6,313,894).

Claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Molsen et al. in view of Sekine et al., and further in view of Hiji et al. (US Pat. 5,872,609).

Claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Molsen et al. in view of Sekine et al., and further in view of Hu et al. (US Pat. 5,517,344).

Summary of Amendment

Claim 11 has been amended to incorporate the features of dependent claim 23. Accordingly, claim 23 has been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Hence, claims 11-18 and 22 are pending for consideration.

Form 1449

Applicant submitted an Information Disclosure Statement on February 10, 2006 with a PTO Form 1449 listing references cited in an Office Action from the Korean Patent Office. However, Applicant has not yet received an initialed copy of the PTO Form 1449 indicating that the submitted references were considered. Applicant requests for a copy of the initialed PTO Form 1449 indicating that the submitted references have been considered.

All Claims Comply Under §103

Claims 11-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Molsen et al. in view of Sekine et al., claim 22 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as

allegedly being unpatentable over Molsen et al. in view of Sekine et al., and further in view of Hiji et al., and claim 23 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Molsen et al. in view of Sekine et al., and further in view of Hu et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

As amended, independent claim 11 recites, in part, “at least a first sealant along a periphery of one of the first and second substrates, at least a second sealant along the periphery of the first sealant, thereby forming at least a double sealant, wherein the first and second sealants surround an entire periphery of one of the first and second substrates and the second sealant completely surrounds the first sealant.” Molsen et al. fails to teach or suggest such a feature. Moreover, Sekine et al., Hiji et al., and Hu et al. do not and cannot cure at least this deficiency. In particular, Hu et al. teaches injection holes formed in the seal. Accordingly, Applicant submits Molsen et al., Sekine et al., Hiji et al., and Hu et al., whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 11, as amended.

Claims 12-18 and 22 depend from claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant submits these claims are allowable for at least the reasons stated above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after

consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: November 13, 2006

By: 

Kyle J. Choi

Reg. No. 41,480

Customer No.: 009626
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001